

In addition, the Examiner's statement that "Lipner does not expressly teach a display of a combination of at least one automatic expression and at least one interactive instruction" in paragraphs 24, 29 and 33 is a tacit admission that Lipner lacks the combination recited in independent claims 4, 11, 14 and 15. Therefore, independent claims 4, 11, 14 and 15 and dependent claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are not anticipated by Lipner.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lipner is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Lipner in view of U.S Patent No. 6,775,576 to Spriggs, hereafter Spriggs.

This rejection is erroneous because claim 8 depends on independent claim 4 via intervening claim 6. That is, Lipner lacks elements recited in independent claim 4 as set forth in the discussion of claim 4. These elements are not disclosed or taught by Spriggs, which was cited for a different reason.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lipner in view of Spriggs is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Lipner in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,803,039 to Impink, Jr. et al., hereafter Impink.

The Examiner admits that "Lipner does not expressly teach a display of a combination of at least one automatic expression and at least one interactive instruction" recited in independent claims 4, 11, 14 and 15. The Examiner contends that Impink supplies this deficiency. This contention is erroneous.

In particular, the Examiner's contends that "Impink teaches to a display of a combination of at least one automatic expression (col. 13, lines 59-62, and col. 14, lines 51-56 and 59-65) and at least one interactive instruction (col. 14, lines 47-50 and 56-59)". The column 14 citation describes the entries in Table II, which is compiled by data logger 53 (Fig. 1) of a time record of a procedure already executed. Table II merely lists the manual or interactive steps of the procedure already executed by the operator. Table II is not even presented to the operator on monitor 27 (Fig. 1). In fact, data logger 53 provides a permanent chronological record, such as Table II, via a printer 55 or a tape recorder (column 8, lines 22-24, column 13, line 67 to column 14, line 2) and is operated independently of display generator 25 (column 8, lines 35-29) that generates the screens of Figs. 2-6 for display on monitor 27. Thus, the column 14 citation does not describe any displayed information and, therefore, does not support the Examiner's contention.

The column 13 citation describes that "Notes or Cautions" that become active are "also" displayed to the user. That is, this information is additionally displayed on the screens of Figs. 2-6. There is no discussion of automatic expression in the column 13 citation. Applicant is unable to find in Impink any description of a table view of a combination of automatic expression and interactive instruction as recited in independent claims 4, 11, 14 and 15. Thus, the column 13 citation does not describe any automatic expression that is displayed to the user and, therefore, does not support the Examiner's contention.

Accordingly, the Examiner's contention is erroneous. Impink does not supply the deficiency of Lipner. Therefore, independent claims 4, 11, 14 and 15 are unobvious in view of the combination of Lipner and Impink.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipner in view of Impink and further in view of Spriggs.

This rejection is erroneous because claim 8 depends on independent claim 4 via intervening claim 6. That is, the combination of Lipner and Impink lacks elements recited in independent claim 4 as set forth in the discussion of claim 4. These elements are not disclosed or taught by Spriggs, which was cited for a different reason.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lipner and Impink in view of Spriggs is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites U.S. Patent No. 4,815,014 that was not applied in the rejection of the claims. This patent has been reviewed, but is believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 2-15 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 7/31/07



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500